From: Garyg Miller
To: lhenry@poha.com
Cc: Luda Voskov; bob.allen@pcs.hctx.net; nhausler@poha.com; gmcmahan@poha.com; jessica.white@noaa.gov; Philip Turner; Ed Barth; Stephen Tzhone; Kent Becher; Hayter, Earl J ERDC-CHL-MS
Subject: Fw: F&T Model Study-SJRWP Superfund Site
Date: 05/04/2012 07:02 AM

Thanks Linda

Gary Miller, P.E. (inactive)
Remedial Project Manager
(214) 665-8318
email: miller.garyg@epa.gov

----- Forwarded by Garyg Miller/R6/USEPA/US on 05/04/2012 07:01 AM -----

From: Linda Henry <lhenry@poha.com>
To: Garyg Miller/R6/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Nicole Hausler <NCass@poha.com>, Garry McMahan <gmcmahan@poha.com>
Date: 05/03/2012 03:49 PM
Subject: F&T Model Study-SJRWP Superfund Site

Gary,

HDR, on behalf of the Port of Houston Authority, has suggested the following points to be discussed during the conference call tomorrow. The report section numbers are given in parentheses. Many of these issues were raised in comments submitted by others, and hopefully this suggested organization will be helpful. Thank you for your consideration, Gary.

- Vessel effects and wind-generated waves were not included in model (2.1)
- Sediment transport and contaminant fate predictions are not relevant to the HSC (3.1); HSC was assumed to have a hard bottom (4.2.2)
- Salinity has minimal variation in the system (3.3.3)
- ADCP data during May 10 – July 13, 2011 were used in calibration (3.4), but data during July 14 – Nov 15 (Appendix B) were not compared to model.
- Depth average velocity at high flows is accurately simulated (3.4), but model underestimates E-W velocity component by 50%.
- 2 criteria for Class 1, cohesive sediments (4.2.2), are too inclusive of sand particles
- Radioactive tracer data on cores (Appendix F) provide little basis for estimating NSR because of apparent interferences on depositional conditions
- NSR is over-predicted at 2 stations and under-predicted at 3 stations (4.2.3) but modelers claim “reasonable accuracy”; factors of differences between predicted and observed are high.
- Sediment mass transport in entire model study area is shown (4.2.2), mass transport in and adjacent to EPA Preliminary Perimeter is not shown but should be.
- Model results for dioxans/furans are compared to data collected during entire simulation period (5.3.2) rather than specific collection years
- Model results were averaged laterally (5.3.2) with no documentation on lateral

variability; lateral variation between TMDL and 2009 TCEQ stations is captured by model (5.3.2) but stations are 0.25 mile apart longitudinally

- No high flow surveys for ADCP data (Appendix B) and TSS data (Appendix D); calibrations don't cover high flows
- Decline in predicted dioxin/furan concentrations are different than observed decline (5.3.2.2 and 6.1) by a factor of 2 (text) but more like 2.5
- Small spatial scales uncertainty in model's predictive capability increases (6.1); highly contaminated areas are the focus of modeling study; show EPA Preliminary Perimeter mass transport.

Linda Henry
Associate General Counsel
Port of Houston Authority
111 East Loop North
Houston, TX 77029
713-670-2663